

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-15 have been examined. Claims 1-3 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claim 4 recites allowable subject matter, and claims 5, 6, 8, and 11-15 are allowed.

Preliminary Matters

Applicants note that the Examiner still has not indicated whether the drawings have been accepted. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner check the appropriate box on the PTOL-326 (Office Action Summary) of the next office paper to indicate that the drawings have been accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,532,966 to Poteet et al. (hereinafter “Poteet”). Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

For example, claim 1 recites a semiconductor device comprising segments having defects among a plurality of segments in a memory block among a plurality of memory blocks are sequentially allocated to a plurality of redundancy memory blocks and replaced by said allocated redundancy memory blocks.

The Examiner contends that Poteet’s array blocks 14 correspond to the claimed memory blocks and the Poteet’s redundant rows 24 and columns 26 correspond to the claimed

redundancy memory blocks. However, Poteet merely discloses that column redundancy is established for the entire corearray 12 (col. 6, lines 33-35). Poteet is silent about any method of allocating defective segments to the redundant rows 24 and columns 26. Thus, Poteet does not teach or suggest segments having defects among a plurality of segments in a memory block among a plurality of memory blocks are *sequentially* allocated to a plurality of redundancy memory blocks and replaced by said allocated redundancy memory blocks, as required by claim 1.

Because Poteet does not teach all of the features of claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Poteet. Applicants also submit that claims 2 and 3, being dependent on claim 1, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5, 6, 8, and 11-15 are allowable. Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 4 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold in abeyance such rewriting until the Examiner has had an opportunity to reconsider (and withdraw) the prior art rejection of the other claims.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/564,626

Attorney Docket No. Q92356

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Sean M. Conner
Registration No. 60,840

Date: December 4, 2007